

11: INDICATORS AND PROPOSALS MAP

POLICY

Indicators to Measure Performance of the Plan

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
English Heritage	276	648	O (rd)	Yes
English Nature	277	672	O (rd)	

OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION
648	Indicator 13 should be expanded to include the number of buildings at risk.
672	There should be additional criteria for amenity green space and water quality.

Main Issues

- 11.1.1 i) Whether indicator 13 should be expanded to include buildings at risk
 ii) Whether additional indicators should be included for net change in local amenity space and change in quality of waters

Conclusions

- 11.1.2 **The first issue.** The Council agree that indicator 13 should be expanded to include buildings at risk and the objector has confirmed this proposed change is acceptable. I consider it would be appropriate to expand the indicator in the manner suggested.
- 11.1.3 **The second issue.** Indicators were included in the revised deposit plan in response to an objection by English Nature. They cover a wide range of matters including the change in protected green space which is an allocation on the proposals map and the subject of policies OL4 and OL5. Local amenity space on the other hand is not allocated and has no definition within the plan. It would therefore in my opinion serve little purpose to include an indicator which did not assess any particular policies or land use.
- 11.1.4 Similarly whilst the plan contains policies for the control of pollution (MW12) and the protection of water resources (MW15) through restricting development which is likely to cause problems for the water environment, fundamentally, water quality is a matter for control by the EA and its licensing regime. Given this situation the quality of water cannot be directly equated to the performance of the plan and it would not provide a suitable indicator to assess the functioning of it or its policies. It follows from this that I do not support the objections insofar as they relate to additional indicators.

Recommendation

- 11.1.5 I recommend that indicator 13 be modified to read*Net change in buildings protected for heritage value and in number of buildings at risk.*

PROPOSALS MAP

Areas Liable to Flooding / Designated Nature Conservation Sites

NAME OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL	OBJ'R	OBJ NO	O or S	C WDR
Environment Agency	279	673	O (rd)	
English Nature	277	671	S (rd)	

OBJ NO	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION
673	The proposals map should include the floodplain at Mossley Mills.
671	Support the additional notation for international sites, national sites and local nature reserves.

Main Issue

- 11.2.1 Whether the proposals map should be amended to reflect the up to date position of the area liable to flooding at Mossley Mills.

Conclusions

- 11.2.2 From the statements I have seen it is evident that there is an ongoing problem in defining the floodplain in the Mossley Mills area. The Council point out that the EA have produced 3 different plans within a three year period. I can understand how this has caused problems for land owners, developers and the Council in seeking to develop a brownfield site. Nevertheless it is important that the development plan includes the most up to date flood plain possible. The flood plain maps are reviewed annually by the Agency. Consequently I consider the flood plain area at Mossley Mills should be modified to reflect the current position at the modification stage of the plan.

Recommendation

- 11.2.3 I recommend that the floodplain in the Mossley Mills area be reviewed at the modification stage in order to take account of the most up to date information available at that time.